



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/379,702		08/24/1999	HISASHI OHTANI	07977/093002	07977/093002 1613	
20985	7590	04/29/2003			•	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE SUITE 500				EXAMINER		
				LEE, EUGENE		
SAN DIEGO	, CA 92	122		ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
				2815		
				DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			- U A
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/379,702	OHTANI ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eugene Lee	2815	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ado	Iress
THE REPLY FILED 17 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	ion. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offmely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (continuous)	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The app originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	•	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	IS.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	I be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NO	T place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a) will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo)⊠ will be entered a ow or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 45-64.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	oved by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		<u> </u>	
0. Other:			
	SUPERVIS	/EDDIE LEE DRY PATENT EXAMA	ÆR
Patent and Trademark Office	TECHNO	LOGY CENTER 2800)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: regarding the applicant's argument (112 rejection) that the original disclosure does disclose a gate electrode over the gate insulating film and the first insulating film having the side that is aligned with the side of the crystalline semiconductor island, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Fig. 1E does not show the gate electrode and FIG. 2A does not show the first insulating film 110 aligned with the side of the crystalline semiconductor island 107. The final structure in FIG. 2E clearly does not show the first insulating film being aligned with the side of the crystalline semiconductor island since the first insulating film 110 extends past the crystalline semiconductor island 107. Page 15, lines 18-22 of the applicant's disclosure does not state anything about the first insulating film having a side that is aligned with the side of the crystalline semiconductor island. Regarding the applicant's argument (103 rejection) that the combination of Yamazaki and Matsumoto does not specify which gate insulating film would have a side aligned with the side of the crystalline semiconductor island, this is not found persuasive since Yamazaki clearly shows in FIG. 3 that the insulating film 3 has an edge that is aligned with the semiconductor island.